

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 01705 272341Z

15

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-02 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05

BIB-01 /088 W

----- 015052

R 271720Z MAR 75

FM USMISSESSON NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 881

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T USNATO 1705

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECTC MBFR: THE COLLECTIVE COMMON CEILING COMMITMENT: SPC MEETING
MARCH 25

REF: A. USNATO 1555 DTG 201735Z MAR 75

B. USNATO 1583 DTG 211730Z MAR 75

C. STATE 64853

SUMMARY: AT MARCH 25 SPC MEETING, BELGIAN REP SUPPORTED THE BELGIAN
TEXT OF MARCH 20 WHICH PROPOSED AN EVENTUAL EXCHANGE OF LETTERS
WITH THE OTHER SIDE ON APPORTIONMENT OF REDUCTIONS BY COUNTRY.
FRG REP, ON INSTRUCTIONS, CHARACTERIZED BELGIAN TEXT OF MARCH
20 AS "EXTREMELY DANGEROUS". BELGIUM MAINTAINED
ITS POSITION THAT SPC SHOULD DRAFT LEGAL LANGUAGE FOR AHG IN
RESPONSE TO AHG REQUEST FOR GUIDANCE ON HOW THE COMMON CEILING
WOULD BE COMPLIED WITH, DESPITE PREFERENCE OF U.S., UK, FRG,
NETHERLANDS, AND CANADA FOR AN ILLUSTRATIVE FORMULATION.
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 01705 272341Z

INTERNATIONAL STAFF WILL NOW PREPARE FOR SPC CONSIDERATION
BRACKETED DRAFT GUIDANCE TO AHG BASED ON BELGIAN LEGAL APPROACH
ON THE ONE HAND, AND ILLUSTRATIVE APPROACH ON THE OTHER HAND.
END SUMMARY.

1. SPC ON MARCH 25 AGAIN CONSIDERED AHG REQUEST FOR GUIDANCE ON HOW THE COLLECTIVE COMMON CEILING WOULD OPERATE.

2. BELGIAN REP (BURNY) REITERATED BELGIAN DESIRE TO SEND AHG A LEGAL TEXT, AND STATED THAT AHG NEEDS SOMETHING MORE THAN THE FORMULATION SUBMITTED BY THE UK AT THE PREVIOUS MEETING (KREFA). BELGIAN REP ALSO EXPLAINED THE TEXT WHICH HE HAD CIRCULATED AT PREVIOUS MEETING PROPOSING AN EXCHANGE OF LETTERS WITH THE OTHER SIDE ON APPROXIMATION OF REDUCTIONS BY COUNTRY (REF A), AND WHICH AMBASSADOR DE STAERCKE HAD REFERRED TO IN NAC ON MARCH 21 (PARA 3, REF B). BELGIUM SAW THIS TEXT AS A MEANS OF PREPARING THE ALLIED POSITION ON THE COMMON CEILING IN A WAY WHICH WOULD MAKE IT MORE PALATABLE TO THE OTHER SIDE. HE STRESSED THAT THE EXCHANGE OF LETTERS WOULD TAKE PLACE PRIOR TO SIGNATURE OF THE TREATY, AND THAT HEADS OF DELEGATIONS IN VIENNA WOULD TRANSMIT THE LETTERS. THIS PROCEDURE, WHILE HELPING TO MAKE THE COMMON CEILING MORE ACCEPTABLE TO THE OTHER SIDE, COULD NOT ESTABLISH NATIONAL SUBCEILINGS. ANY NAC GUIDANCE BASED ON THE BELGIAN TEXT REGARDING AN EXCHANGE OF LETTERS WOULD BE FOR INTERNAL USE OF THE AHG UNTIL THE PROPER TIME TO USE IT WITH THE EAST.

3. UK REP (BAILES) SAID HER AUTHORITIES BELIEVED IT WOULD BE BETTER NOT TO GET INTO THE MATTER OF AN EXCHANGE OF LETTERS AT THE PRESENT TIME. SHE REITERATED UK BELIEF THAT SPC SHOULD NOT TRY TO DRAFT LEGAL LANGUAGE AT THIS TIME.

4. DUTCH REP (MEESMAN) ALSO OPPOSED DRAFTING OF LEGAL LANGUAGE AT THIS TIME. HE ALSO QUESTIONED PARAS 4 D AND 5 OF THE UK PAPER (REF A) WHICH REFERRED TO POST-REDUCTION MACHINERY. HE STATED IT WAS NOT NECESSARY TO GO INTO THIS QUESTION NOW.

5. U.S. REP (MOORE) PRESENTED THE VIEWS CONTAINED IN REF C.

6. FRG REP (HOYNCK) SAID HIS AUTHORITIES AGREED WITH PARAS 4A TO C OF THE FORMULATION IN THE UK PAPER, EXCEPT THAT THEY
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 01705 272341Z

PREFERRED REFERENCE TO "DIRECT PARTICIPANT " INSTEAD OF "SIGNATORIES". ON PARA 4D REGARDING REGULAR EXCHANGE OF DATA, HIS AUTHORITIES HAD FORMED NO JUDGMENT. FRG CONSIDERED MATERIAL IN PARA 5 ON POST-REDUCTION MACHINERY TO PREMATURE, AND THOUGHT SIMPLE REFERENCE TO A MAILING ADDRESS ON EACH SIDE WOULD SUFFICE.

7. FRG REP OPPOSED WORK ON LEGAL LANGUAGE AT THIS TIME. REGARDING THE BELGIAN TEXT SUBMITTED AT THE PREVIOUS MEETING (REF A), HIS AUTHORITIES HAD INSTRUCTED HIM TO EXPRESS "VERY STRONG DOUBTS." THIS WAS AN "EXTREMELY DANGEROUS" PROCEDURE. ONCE THE ALLIES STARTED TO INDIVIDUALIZE THE REDUCTIONS IN THIS MANNER, IT WOULD BE VERY DIFFICULT TO MAKE CLEAR TO THE OTHER SIDE THAT

THE COMMON CEILING APPLIES TO THE WHOLE ALLIED SIDE, AND THAT THERE WILL BE NO NATIONAL SUBCEILINGS. THIS BELGIAN TEXT IS NOT SOMETHING THE SPC NEEDS TO GO INTO IN ORDER TO ANSWER VIENNA'S QUESTION ON HOW TO COMPLY WITH THE COMMON CEILING. DISCUSSION OF THE BELGIAN TEXT IN SPC, IF IT LEADKED TO THE OTHER SIDE, WOULD LEAD THE EAST TO SMELL ALLIED WEAKENING ON NATIONAL SUBCEILINGS.

BELGIAN REP REPLIED THAT NATO MUST CONDUCT ITS NECESSAR BUSINESS, EVEN THOUGHT THE POSSIBLITY OF LEAKS EXISTS ON ANYTHING WHICH NATO DOES.

8. UK REP ACKNOWLEDGED THAT IT MIGHT BE TO EARLY TO GO VERY MUCH INTO THE POST-REDUCTION COMPLAINTS MACHINERY. SHE SAW A LARGE DEGREE OF CONSENSUS IN THE UK, FRG, AND U.S. APPROACHES. SHE OBSERVED THAT THE U.S. APPORACH DID NOT COVER THE IDEA IN PARA 4 A OF THE UK PAPER, ON REDUCTION OF AGGREGATE TOTALS FROM THE AGREED BASE FIGURE ON REDUCTIONS TO THE AGREED COMMON CEILING FIGURE.

9. MC REP (GROUP CAPTAIN SMITH) SAW AN ADVANTAGE IN THIS IMISSION FROM THE U.S. FORMULATION, IN THAT THE ALLIES HAD NEVER DECIDED THAT AGREED DATA WAS AN ESSENTIAL STARTING POINT FOR REDUCTIONS. U.S. REP NOTED THATAHG REQUEST FOR GUIDANCE HAD ORIGINATED IN EASTERN CLAIMS THAT COMMON CEILING CONCEPT WAS INOPERABLE, AND THAT ONLY FEASIBLE COURSE WAS NATIONAL CEILINGS. AHG HAD REQUESTED GUIDANCE ON HOW THE COMMON CEILING WOLD BE COMPLIED WITH IN ORDER TO ARGUE AGAINST THESE EASTERN CLAIMS. HE WONDERED IF IT WOULD NOT WEAKEN THE SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 01705 272341Z

THE
FORCE OF THE AHG ARGUMENT THAT THE COMMON CEILING WAS AN OPERABLE CONCEPT, IF THE NAC GUIDANCE ALSO REQUIRED THE AHG AT THE SAME TIME TO BRING IN MATERIAL ON HOW THE COMMON CEILING WOULD BE REACHED, WHICH APPRERED TO BE A SEPARATE QUESTION.

10. INTERNATIONAL STAFF WILL NOW PREPARE BRACKETED DRAFT GUIDANCE TO AHG BASED ON BELGIAN LGAL APPROACH ON THE ONE HAND, AND U.S.-UK-FRG ILLUSTRATIVE APPROACH ON THE OTHER HAND TO FACILITATE CONSIDERATION BY SPC. MISSION WILL WORK WITH IS AND OTHER DELEGATIONSAND TRANSMIT THIS PAPER UPON COMPLETION. NEXT SPC COSIDERATION OF THIS MATTER WILL TAKE PLACE THURSDAY, APRIL 3.
PEREZ

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 27 MAR 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: GolinoFR
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO001705
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: USMISSION NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750398/abbrzjao.tel
Line Count: 158
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A. USNATO 1555 DTG 201735Z MAR 75 B. USNATO 1583 DTG 211730Z MAR 75 C. STATE 64853
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: GolinoFR
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 03 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <03 APR 2003 by KelleyW0>; APPROVED <07 APR 2003 by GolinoFR>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
05 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: SUBJECTC MBFR: THE COLLECTIVE COMMON CEILING COMMITMENT: SPC MEETING MARCH 25
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO BONN
LONDON
MBFR VIENNA
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006